

Amendments to the Drawings:

Corrected drawings are supplied herewith, including two replacement sheets which include Fig. 1-2, and which replace the original sheets.

In Fig. 1 and 2 Guest Driver 115 was changed to Guest Driver 125.

Attachments: Two replacement sheets.

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's attention to the above referenced application. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested. Claim 17 received an objection. Claims 1 – 20 were rejected. Claim 17 has been amended. Claims 1 – 20 are now pending, of which claims 1, 7, 9, 12, and 19 are independent.

Notice of References Cited

Applicant respectfully notes that the PTO-892 form provided with the Office Action dated March 25, 2008 cites two additional references not referenced in the Office Action, U.S. Patent No. 6,606,697 to Kawahara et al., and U.S. Patent No. 6,447,612 to Moriyama et al. Furthermore, U.S. Patent No. 6,477,612 to Wang, which is cited in the Office Action, is not included in the PTO-892 form. U.S. Patent No. 6,606,697 to Kawahara et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,447,612 to Moriyama et al. have not been addressed in this response, and the rejections in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,477,612 to Wang are addressed.

Claim Objections

Claim 17 received an objection. Claim 17 has been amended in response to the objection. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 17 is now in condition for allowance.

35 USC § 103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1 – 20 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bugnion et al. (U.S. 6,075,938), in view of Carrozza et al. (U.S. 6,445,685 B1), further in view of Wang (U.S. 6,477,612 B1). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, which should be withdrawn for at least the reasons set forth herein.

The Office Action dated March 25, 2008 has failed to present a prima facie case of obviousness. Three disparate references have been combined as allegedly teaching different elements of independent claims 1, 7, 9, 12, and 19.

With reference to the claim element “placing the incoming packet into at least one of the unmapped buffers” of claim 1 (and substantially similar limitations in independent claims 7, 9, 12, and 19), the Office Action on page 3 cites Carrozza Figs. 5 and 6 and column 12 lines 56-57, which read as follows: “Referring to Fig. 5, the memory allocation of the data demultiplexing and reordering buffer 72 is shown in further detail.” Applicant has attempted to understand the relationship between the demultiplexing and reordering buffer 72 of Carrozza and the unmapped buffer of the claimed invention, and can find no evidence of such a relationship. Furthermore, Applicant has searched the Carrozza reference and can find no discussion of the following claim terms: unmapped buffers, mapping, virtual machines, physical addresses, and direct memory access. Because the Carrozza reference deals with an uplink demodulator scheme for a processing satellite, and provides no discussion of the claim terms mentioned above, Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to use the Carrozza reference for any teaching related to the claimed invention. The statement on page 5 of the Office Action dated March 25, 2008 indicating that the Carrozza reference would be combined with the Bugnion reference “to support a buffer that is shared by multiple virtual machines” is a mere conclusory statement, as the Bugnion reference itself claims “to support a global buffer cache that is transparently shared across all virtual machines.” (See Bugnion, column 7, lines 43-46.) The Office Action has failed to articulate a reason why a person of ordinary skill in the art would have combined the prior art elements in the manner claimed.

For at least this reason, independent claims 1, 7, 9, 12, and 19 are allowable. Claims 2-6 depend from independent claim 1; claim 8 depends from independent claim 7; claims 10-11 depend from independent claim 9; claims 13-18 depend from independent claim 12; and claim 20 depends from independent claim 19. Each of these dependent claims is allowable for at least the same reasons that the respective independent claim is allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the remarks and amendments set forth above. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at 512-732-1303. Please charge any shortage of fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 50-0221 and please credit any excess fees to such account.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 8/22/08

/D'Ann Naylor Rifai/

D'Ann Naylor Rifai,
Reg. No. 47,026
Patent Attorney
Intel Corporation
512-732-1303

Intel Corporation
c/o Intellevate, LLC
P.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 55402